

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 470

AC 010 368

AUTHOR Farmer, James A., Jr.; And Others
TITLE Leadership Development in Evaluation for an Age of Accountability.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 32p.
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Concept Formation, *Evaluation Techniques, Learning Activities, Models, *Workshops

ABSTRACT

The Western Region AMIDS Evaluation Team examined a variety of approaches to leadership development which would make it possible for adult, business, technical and vocational educators to become knowledgeable in evaluation. The following three intents were specified for the leadership development project: (1) to provide participants with an introductory program in evaluative theory and methodology, (2) to develop basic evaluative skills concerning techniques for evaluation of on-going programs in adult, business, technical and vocational education, (3) to provide participants with sufficient reference materials and direction to enable them to undertake subsequent, individual study activities in the area of evaluation. A one-day workshop was planned for 21 participants. An inductive-deductive learning approach was selected for both the workshop and the individual study phase of this leadership development activity. During the first hour of the workshop, a "case model" was distributed. The afternoon activities started with a team teaching session dealing with the concepts of performance standards and standards of excellence. The last hour of the workshop was devoted to a presentation of evaluation techniques and methodology appropriate to adult, business, technical and vocational education. In general the participants were very positive in their reactions to the workshop. (CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN EVALUATION FOR AN AGE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

*A Workshop and
Individual Study
Approach for the
Fields of Adult,
Business, Technical,
and Vocational
Education*

James A. Farmer, Jr.

Patrick I. Weagraff

altas

ller

AC 610 368

FOREWORD

The areas of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education have recently experienced a revival of interest and concern for evaluation and accountability. In particular, and of major interest, is the development of new and unique ideas about evaluation which lend themselves to popular adaptation in the programs of adult, vocational and technical education.

Accordingly the California State Department of Education, Vocational Education Section, in cooperation with the Division of Vocational Education, University of California, formalized a depth study of Leadership Development in Evaluation for the purposes of improving general accountability in adult, vocational and technical education, and requested Professor James A. Farmer, Jr., Graduate School of Education, University of California, Los Angeles, to provide the leadership in developing further some of his evaluation principles and practices.

Involved in the evaluation study are members of the EPDA Leadership Development Program who are in residence as Graduate students at UCLA under the provisions of Sec. 552, Part F, Education Professions Development Act, P. L. 90-35.

Melvin L. Barlow, Director
Division of Vocational Education
University of California

Professor of Education
University of California
Los Angeles

Richard S. Nelson, Chief
Program Operations Unit
Vocational Education Section
California State Department of
Education
Sacramento, California

LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN EVALUATION FOR AN AGE OF ACCOUNTABILITY

by:

James A. Farmer, Jr.
Assistant Professor of Education - University of California, Los Angeles

Patrick J. Weagraff
Research Specialist and EPDA Fellow, Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Christ T. Chialtas
Research Specialist and EPDA Fellow, Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Joseph A. Miller
Research Specialist and EPDA Fellow, Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Intent	2
Participant Needs	2
Program Plan	3
Instructional Sequence and Methodology	3
Selected Aspects of Evaluation Presented	5
On-going Individual Study	6
Participant Profile	7
Identification and Analysis of Participants'	
Needs and Expectations	9
Participants' Assessment of Workshop	10
Implications for Future Workshops and	
Individual Study	12
 Appendix	
A. Agenda	15
B. Case Model	17
C. Participant Feedback Questionnaire	21
D. Workshop Pre-Test and Post-Test	24

INTRODUCTION

What is responsible evaluation in the fields of adult, business, technical, and vocational education? How is educational evaluation conducted? What types of evaluation skills do future educational leaders require? These are the questions which confronted the Division of Vocational Education, University of California, Los Angeles, and the EPDA Leadership Program at UCLA. A variety of approaches were considered to meet the needs for training in evaluation on the part of those asking these questions. It was then determined that a workshop, coupled with some form of individual study, would most appropriately meet this need.

Leadership development in evaluation for an age of accountability was selected as the theme for a workshop and an individual study approach. This report describes, in bold strokes, an overview of the workshop and what it accomplished. Also included is a description of how the individual study approach is being implemented.

Intent

The need for leadership development in evaluation was articulated in the early Fall of 1970 by several EPDA Fellows and staff members of the Division of Vocational Education. As a result of these requests, the Western Region AMIDS Evaluation Team examined a variety of approaches to leadership development which would make it possible for adult, business, technical and vocational educators to become knowledgeable in evaluation. By December of 1970, a proposed work plan encompassing a workshop and individual study approach was prepared. The following three principal intents were specified for the leadership development project:

1. To provide participants with an introductory program in evaluative theory and methodology.
2. To develop basic evaluative skills concerning techniques for evaluation of on-going programs in adult, business, technical and vocational education.
3. To provide participants with sufficient reference materials and direction to enable them to undertake subsequent, individual study activities in the area of evaluation.

Participant Needs

While agreement on the value of knowledge about evaluation was acknowledged by personnel in the Division and by EPDA Fellows, the exact nature and extent of their needs was not known. It was known, however, that their backgrounds were diverse. Participants had held, or now hold,

positions as administrators, teachers, curriculum developers, and training specialists. Because of this diversity, it was decided that an introductory workshop, combining inductive and deductive experiences, followed by a suggested program of study would provide the best results. This approach ensured that all participants would be exposed to key concepts of evaluation. It also provided those individuals with a need, or a desire for, additional study with the necessary references.

Program Plan

A one-day workshop was planned for approximately twenty participants. During January, 1971, materials were developed, agendas were set and staff assignments made. It was decided that the workshop would be conducted in the Conference Room of the Division of Vocational Education in Santa Monica, California. This off-campus setting was far enough from UCLA to minimize interruptions. At the same time, the location was not so far from the campus as to discourage attendance. The Conference Room comfortably seats twenty people and contains blackboards and a projection screen. Three smaller rooms in the same building were also available for group meetings. In retrospect, the location and facilities greatly enhanced the learning situation.

Instructional Sequence and Methodology

An inductive-deductive learning approach was selected for both the workshop and the individual study phase of this leadership development activity. It was felt that such an approach, coupled with diverse instructional methods, would result in the participants developing a core of

knowledge concerning evaluation and would intensify a desire for further study.

During the first hour of the workshop, a "case model" (Appendix B) was distributed. Participants were divided into three groups of five to eight individuals. Each group had a discussion leader experienced in the field of evaluation. In the small group sessions, the participants dealt inductively with the following questions: (1) What key functions in the case model should be evaluated? (2) What are the advantages and disadvantages of external versus internal evaluation methodology? (3) To what extent should the selection of aspects to be evaluated take into account the various groups which require feedback? Later in the morning, the participants and the workshop staff met again in a general session to discuss the functions identified in the small groups. During this period, the workshop staff incorporated into the discussion a number of important aspects of evaluation which had grown out of their AMIDS Evaluation Project.

Dr. Stephen Klein, from the Center for Study of Evaluation, University of California, Los Angeles, was the speaker for the workshop luncheon. His presentation dealt with the roots of evaluation and its current status. He also discussed an evaluative model which the Center had developed. A forty-minute question and answer period followed the presentation.

The afternoon activities started with a team teaching session dealing with the concepts of "performance standards" and "standards of excellence." During this part of the workshop the staff again incorporated numerous key aspects of evaluation into the discussion. Particularly, emphasis was placed on the evaluative model which had been developed by the staff in the Western AMIDS Evaluation Project.

It became evident to the workshop staff, early in the afternoon, that the participants desired and were ready for additional discussion concerning "standards of excellence." The identification of such a need was possible because of the inductive-deductive approach being used. As a result, the small group sessions, which had been originally scheduled for the late afternoon, were cancelled to allow for additional consideration of "standards of excellence." The last hour of the workshop was devoted to a presentation of evaluation techniques and methodology appropriate to adult, business, technical and vocational education.

Selected Aspects of Evaluation Presented

During the program planning stage, key aspects of evaluation were selected for presentation during the workshop. Those key aspects were selected which would best meet the needs of the participants as identified in the workshop. The key aspects of evaluation presented at the workshop were as follows:

1. Purpose of evaluation
2. Terminology of Evaluation
3. Elements of Evaluation
4. Key Indicators
5. Constraints and other Considerations in Evaluation
6. Standards of Excellence
7. Types of Evaluation
8. Chartering
9. Internal and External Evaluation

10. Absolute Comparisons
11. Relative Comparisons
12. Differentiated Feedback
13. Development of Evaluation Theory and Methodology
14. Contributions of Leaders in the Field of Evaluation

On-going Individual Study

Recognizing that a major objective of this leadership development activity was to provide participants with sufficient data and direction that they might undertake individual study of evaluation following the workshop, each attendee received an 82-page workbook developed by the staff. This "Evaluation Workbook" was designed to present materials which would help the participants gain skills requisite to responsible program evaluation. It should be noted that, where necessary, authorization was obtained to reproduce materials on evaluation to be included in the workbook. The workbook contained the following materials:

"The Growth of Evaluation Methodology"
by Gene V. Glass

Western Region AMIDS Evaluation
by James A. Farmer, Jr.,
Ralph K. Sylvester, and
Patrick J. Weagraff

"Western Region AMIDS Evaluation - A New Venture"
by Patrick J. Weagraff

"Indigenous Interactional Research"
by James A. Farmer, Jr.

Selected References on Evaluation

Participant Profile

The following profile of the workshop participants can be constructed from two sources available to the workshop staff. The first is the information given on the cover sheet of the pre- or needs-assessment test (Appendix D) which was completed by the participants. The second source is a roster/data sheet of students attending UCLA through the EPDA Leadership Development Program in adult, business, technical, and vocational education.

The characteristics of the attendees include the following:

- o A total of 21 such leaders and potential leaders participated in the workshop. Four of these participants, who are members of the Western AMIDS Evaluation Team, served as the workshop staff.
- o Twelve participants are EPDA Leadership Fellows presently attending UCLA and pursuing doctoral degrees in adult, business, technical, and vocational education. Three participants are professors of Education at UCLA. One of the participants is Chief, Program Operations Unit, Vocational Education Section, California State Department of Education. Two of the professors are further involved in duties within the Division of Vocational Education located on the UCLA campus. One of them is Division Director; the other, a project director for the Division.

One remaining attendee is also a project director for the Division of Vocational Education.

- o All of the participants have at least one advanced degree. Four presently hold doctorates. Of the EPDA Fellows in attendance, ten are seeking the Ed.D., and two, the Ph.D., in education.
- o The twelve Fellows brought to the workshop a wide range of background experiences gained through positions held prior to their acceptance of the leadership awards. Following is a summary list of those positions:

State Supervisor.....State Department of Education
Assistant State

Supervisor.....State Department of Education
Specialist.....State Department of Education
Coordinator, Curriculum Development...State Department of Education/
State University

Director.....Post Secondary Vocational/
Technical Institute

Director, Vocational/
Academic
Counseling.....State University

Research Fellow.....State University

- o Participants indicated that their primary areas of educational interest and involvement are the following:

Adult Education
Agricultural Education
Business/office Education
Distributive Education

Industrial Arts Education
Trade and Industrial Education
Vocational/academic Counseling
Vocational/technical Education

- o Participants represent a total of seven states. Eleven are from California, with one each from Mississippi, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Utah, and Wisconsin.
- o Of the 17 participants, there were 16 males in attendance.

Identification and Analysis of Participants' Needs and Expectations

The needs and expectations which the participants brought to the workshop can be generalized from analyses of two sources: (1) open-ended responses made by several participants on item 1 of the Participant Feedback questionnaire (Appendix C) given to attendees for return by mail; and (2) errors made by participants taking the pre- or needs-assessment test at the beginning of the workshop.

Item 1 of the Participant Feedback questionnaire was intended to elicit open-ended responses as to what each person expected and hoped to receive from the workshop. Questionnaires returned to the workshop staff indicated the following:

- o Participants expressed a variety of expectations and needs. Some persons identified need for instruction in methods and techniques for the evaluation process. Others identified the need for conceptual learning concerning evaluation. The problem of accountability and evaluation in an age of accountability were also identified.

Incorrect responses on the forced-choice items and inadequate responses on the open-ended items of the pre-test were taken as further indicators of need in specific aspects of evaluation considered important by the workshop staff.

- o Analysis of these items indicated the greatest need to be in connection with the following aspects of evaluation: selection of key indicators; evaluation of on-going programs; and identification of program intents and plans.

Consequently, members of the workshop staff focused particular attention on these aspects in both the inductive and the deductive segments of the workshop.

Participants' Assessment of Workshop

The comments made by the participants in the small-group sessions and directly to the workshop staff during the day, expressed the participants' opinion that the workshop on evaluation was a valuable experience in leadership development.

Additional feedback about the workshop was received on the Participant Feedback questionnaires (Appendix C), which were distributed to participants at the end of the workshop, and which were anonymously completed by the individual participants for return by mail. The following participant assessments were expressed on these questionnaires.

- o All of the participants responding indicated that the workshop evidenced good planning and/or

organization. Several also stated that the materials used were appropriate and that the instructional methods used tended to maximize learner participation.

- o Many participants indicated that the workshop resulted in conceptual and/or methodological learnings. Several comments focused on the fact that they had gained knowledge of techniques useful in conducting evaluations. One individual stated that he received more than he had expected in these regards.
- o There was a wide range of responses to items 2 through 7 of the questionnaire, all of which requested suggestions useful in improving future workshops. Some participants recommended that more workshops of a similar nature are needed. Others indicated possible ways to improve specific components of the workshop. One such recommendation proposed that an additional case study dealing with an actual evaluation in action be developed and utilized in future evaluation workshops.
- o In general, the participants were very positive in their reactions to the workshop. The following sample comments from the feedback questionnaires indicate such satisfaction:

- "For me, just fine."
- "It was excellent."
- "Let's do it again."
- "I would like to thank everyone
involved in the organization and
presentation of the workshop."

Some indication that favorable reactions were accompanied by learning gains was provided by a comparison of the results of the brief pre- and post-tests (Appendix D) administered at the workshop. Learning gain seems to be particularly evident in relation to one of the aspects earlier identified as an area of greatest need; namely, that of selection of key indicators in evaluation.

Implications for Future Workshops and Individual Study

Based upon the experience of the workshop described in this report, the following implications for future workshops and for the individual study approach are evident:

- o Provision for some form of systematic follow-up to the workshop on evaluation, which was held February 9, 1971, should be made. That workshop constituted a first step, providing instruction in only those conceptual and methodological aspects of evaluation described earlier. Further help to the participants, particularly the EPDA Fellows presently involved in the leadership program at UCLA, in this vital area of

leadership development seems to be necessary.

- o The members of the Western AMIDS Evaluation Team, who acted as the workshop staff, are presently following up on some recommendations suggested by the participants. For example, the idea of developing and utilizing a naturalistic case model of an actual evaluation in action has been discussed and will be given further consideration.
- o The literature in the field of evaluation and accountability, together with the current limitations of funds in education, suggest that in-service leadership training of a variety of kinds is needed by personnel in adult, business, technical, and vocational education.
- o Both informal and formal feedback from the participants in the workshop on evaluation indicate a great deal of interest in the general subject of, and variety of, aspects comprising evaluation. The number of requests from others for information about evaluation regarding adult, business, technical, and vocational education, which have been directed to the workshop staff, indicates that there is a growing pressure on the personnel in these fields to become operationally knowledgeable in evaluation for purposes of accountability.

- o It would seem that the inductive-deductive approach described in this report allows participants to share experiences and understandings which they bring to a workshop. Such personal experiences in and knowledge of evaluation can help to equip workshop participants for leadership in an age of accountability.

APPENDIX A

AGENDA

Evaluation Workshop

8:00 a.m.	Welcoming Remarks	M. L. Barlow
8:30 a.m.	Case Model	P. J. Weagraff
9:00 a.m.	Small Group Sessions	
	"Identifying Key Functions In Case Model to Evaluate"	J. Farmer, Jr. P. Weagraff C. Chialtas J. Miller
10:00 a.m.	Coffee Break	
10:15 a.m.	General Session	J. Farmer, Jr.
11:45 a.m.	Break	
12:00 noon	Luncheon	
2:00 p.m.	General Session	J. Farmer, Jr.
2:45 p.m.	Small Group Sessions	
	"Performance Standards"	J. Farmer, Jr. P. Weagraff C. Chialtas J. Miller
3:15 p.m.	General Session	
	Group Reports	
4:00 p.m.	Panel "Evaluative Techniques" and Audience Participation	J. Farmer, Jr. P. Weagraff C. Chialtas J. Miller

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Workshop

Case Model

Occupational Skill Center Program Evaluation

George Reynolds is Director of the Inner City Occupational Skill Center for Adults. The center which is three years old serves a population of 180,195.

The Occupational Skill Center is one of 14 centers in the state, but it is the only one operated under contract by the local school district. The program at the Center primarily emphasizes the occupational preparation of adults with some attention given to adult basic education, vocational rehabilitation, and GED certification. Occupational preparation is offered in office practices, automotive, printing, allied health, and food services. The center also offers periodic training for power sewing machine operators, food cashiers, and electrical assemblers when local employers require such skills.

Most of the funds used to support the Center's program come through the local school district. The district receives most of its funds from the State Department of Education. Specific funding sources include the Vocational Education Act of 1968 and the 1966 Adult Education Act. In addition, the district receives funds from the State Department of Human Resources, the Department of Labor and the Veterans Administration. Local taxes and tuition assessment of some participants also are sources of revenue.

The total Center program has both day and evening components with a combined enrollment of approximately 305 students, both full and part-time. Most of the participants (73%) are enrolled in the day program. Half of

the students are public aid recipients, many of whom are ADC mothers. The age range is 18-64 years. There are more women than men participants. Most of the participants, black and white, have low socio-economic backgrounds. A few participants of foreign birth are enrolled in the program for the purpose of learning to read and write English.

The director of the Center is on a full time appointment and supervises both the day and evening programs. The day teaching staff consists of 26 full-time and 10 part-time instructors. The evening staff includes four of the day staff members and five additional ones. Only one of the staff has not had prior experience in the public schools. None of the staff had experience in any manpower training activities prior to joining the Centers.

In addition to the instructors, the staff includes a full-time public aid case worker and two counselors. One counselor is concerned with basic education; the other is a vocational coordinator who provides help in job placement and works with students in establishing realistic work goals.

The instructional program is diverse, being designed in many cases to meet individual student needs. Classes operate from 7 a.m. to 9 p.m. For GED aspirants, there is a full-time program which runs from 9:20 a.m. to 2:20 p.m. five days a week. Occupational preparation occurs between 7 a.m. and 4 p.m. with students being released to take the basic education they require for occupational proficiency. In general, there are no standard beginning and ending dates for any program.

A most interesting aspect of the program is the close relationship the Center maintains with local employers. Mr. Reynolds has over 20 active advisory groups.

The Center has several activities it regards as unique. To enhance the likelihood for potential participants (especially ADC mothers) with pre-school children to enroll in the program a day care program has been established. This program also serves to train para-professionals in early childhood services.

Due to the complexities involved in the administration and financing of the Center, the director feels accountable, in different ways, to several audiences. For example, the local district is primarily interested in the smooth operation of the Center. The Department of Human Resources is most interested in the rate of student placement on jobs. The teaching staff of the Center is interested in program revision and improvement. The local employers look to the Center for a pool of trained manpower. The State Department of Education views evidence of fiscal accountability as important data on which they evaluate the Center.

Given the possibility that evaluative data about the Center could be obtained and that Mr. Reynolds turned to your evaluative teams for assistance, what appropriate information would you provide him with for decision-making as an administrator? As a first step in this process, he has asked your team to provide answers to the following questions:

1. What aspects of the Center should be evaluated? (List)
2. Who should do what in the evaluation of those aspects which you specified in #1?
3. To what extent should the selection of aspects to be evaluated take into account the various audiences which require feedback? (See page 3, 2nd paragraph) Why?

APPENDIX C

EVALUATIVE RESEARCH WORKSHOP

Conducted
for

Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

Dr. James A. Farmer, Project Director, Western AMIDS Evaluation
Patrick J. Weagraff, Christ T. Chialtas, and Joseph A. Miller,
Research Specialists and EPDA Leadership Fellows

Participant Feedback

Please answer honestly and candidly the following questions about the workshop on evaluative research you attended February 9, 1971. Please give adequate thought to each question before making your response. Your responses will be used constructively by the evaluative research team in its efforts to modify such workshops for the benefit of future participants by assessing strengths and weaknesses. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is attached for your convenience in returning your thoughts to us.

1. What had you expected and hoped to receive from the workshop?
2. What did you actually experience during the workshop (please be as specific as possible)?
3. What inputs or effort did you see going into the program?
4. What outcomes or results did you see coming out of the program (personally and for the group)?

5. Given the extent of the need for such a workshop, how adequate were the outcomes?

6. What recommendations can you make for improving the workshop?

7. Additional comments.

APPENDIX D

EVALUATIVE RESEARCH WORKSHOP

Conducted
for

Division of Vocational Education
University of California, Los Angeles

by

Dr. James A. Farmer, Jr., Project Director, Western AMIDS Evaluation
Patrick J. Weagraff, Christ T. Chialtas, and Joseph A. Miller,
Research Specialists and EPDA Leadership Fellows

Pre- and Post-Tests

This evaluation instrument is aimed at indicating your understanding of program evaluation, both generally and as embodied in the program evaluation model of the Western AMIDS evaluation team. It will be administered in two parts - the pre-test, attached to this cover sheet and to be completed at this time, and the post-test, to be given to you at the end of this workshop.

Please provide the following information about yourself. Only the Evaluation team will see your paper. The responses will be analyzed and used in differentiated reports to interested, appropriate parties. NOTE: As we are not asking for your name, please make sure to indicate your date of birth, here and on the post-test, so that your pre- and post-test can be paired.

Date of Workshop _____ Date of Birth _____

Sex _____ State of Residence _____

Position (last held, if student) _____

Degrees: Obtained _____, Sought _____

Vocational Field (Ex: Agricultural Education) _____

PRE-TEST

Directions: Write "T" in the space to the left of each item if the statement is true based on current thinking in evaluative research; write "F" if the statement is false.

-
- _____ 1. Evaluation should seek to determine the degrees of success in achieving only the major objectives of a program.
 - _____ 2. The "best laid plans of mice and men" often do not see total fruition; an evaluator must therefore concern himself only with what actually enters, is processed, and results from the system being evaluated.
 - _____ 3. Since the evaluation of educational programs consists largely of course exams, learner self-appraisal and satisfaction forms, and analyses of enrollment, any effective evaluative research model would best structure itself around these feedback devices.
 - _____ 4. Feedback from the evaluator to key personnel of an on-going program is illegitimate in that it biases what the evaluator, in fact a researcher, is attempting to measure.
 - _____ 5. Evaluation, like a photograph, can merely seek to describe past events or conditions; in particular, it can at best show past successes/failures and achievements of an on-going program.
 - _____ 6. Objectives can be immediate, intermediate, or long-run with respect to duration and importance.
 - _____ 7. Since evaluation describes the present operation of a program, background research with respect to goals, intents, and assumptions are not too important.
 - _____ 8. The determination of whether or not an objective could be better or less costly achieved through an alternative procedure is a value judgment inconsistent with the proper role of an evaluator.
 - _____ 9. "The fact that our office successfully referred over 200 applicants to appropriate manpower agencies last month for training is a good indication of the adequacy of our guidance service."
 - _____ 10. The comparison between the program being evaluated and like or related programs provides the sum total of wholistic comparative data for the evaluator.
 - _____ 11. Evaluation can be likened to the constructing of a balance sheet in that the results constitute a static picture of conditions at a given point.

- _____ 12. In evaluation, by its nature a subjective process, the evaluator must seek support for his measurement criteria so as to help validate them.

Directions: Respond to the following open-ended items within the space provided even though you may need more.

- _____
13. Identify or list those factors which you consider to be critical for the evaluation of an on-going program in adult, vocational or business education.
14. In one sentence identify what you perceive to be the major purpose of an evaluation of an on-going program.
15. List the names of some individuals generally recognized as being leaders in the field of evaluative research.

Date of Birth _____

POST-TEST

Directions: Write "T" in the space to the left of each item if the statement is true based on current thinking in evaluative research; write "F" if the statement is false.

- _____ 1. Since it is impossible to collect data on every aim or facet of an on-going program, evaluative efforts must be selective in their identification of specifics worth evaluating.
- _____ 2. An intended, but un-realized, input to a program is inadmissible "evidence" in the judging of the success/failure of that program.
- _____ 3. Given that we're entering an age of accountability in education, there is still a lack of methodological convention in evaluative research of on-going programs.
- _____ 4. In the course of evaluating a program, much is learned about why and where it has failed; such evidence for making decisions can justifiably be given to administration through feedback from the evaluator.
- _____ 5. Any evaluative effort worth conducting should have as an objective the identification of emergent or indicated future needs of the program being evaluated.
- _____ 6. Objectives can be hierarchical in nature in that one may be all-inclusive of those supportive and subordinate to it.
- _____ 7. Before one can make unblinded observations of aspects of a program, awareness of the assumptions, plans, and goals, etc., recognized by administration as relevant, is necessary.
- _____ 8. The evaluator, in order to maintain his researcher posture, should stay away from such administrative measures as cost-benefit analysis.
- _____ 9. While a measure of results is important, the total assessed need for such performance provides a baseline from which to judge the adequacy of the results.
- _____ 10. A kind of evaluative comparison can be made between the program evaluated and a hypothetical, excellent one.

ERIC Clearinghouse

JUL 7 1971

on Adult Education